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Reviewer’s report:

Congratulations for your technique and your interesting article.

Here are my comments and recommendations for your article

Abstract:

Line 6: Missing word. ...reduce the complication...

Line 12: Joint degeneration cannot be assessed after short-term follow-up. Please state your follow-up period.

Introduction:

Line 33: Replace longt-term by long

Line 40: The context of this sentence is not clear.

Line 81: A 2.5 cm incision sound very small, if you want to get an oscillating saw 20 mm behind the tip of the coracoid.

Line 98: What do you mean by „in case of injury" was the nerve not exposed in every case?

Line 108: And if it was fixed too medially?

Results:

Line 150: Your range (24-30 months) and your average FU do not seem to fit together properly.

Discussion:

Line 216: How ist he fibrous union rate in other studies?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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